Appendix A

to

Joint Proposed Jury Instructions

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

AMDOCS (ISRAEL) LIMITED, an Israeli Corporation, Plaintiff, v. OPENET TELECOM, INC., a Delaware Corporation, and OPENET TELECOM LTD., an Irish Corporation, Defendants.	Case No. 1:10cv910 (LMB/TRJ)

AMDOCS' PROPOSED VERDICT FORM

Plaintiff Amdocs (Israel) Limited respectively requests that the following verdict form be

presented to the jury at the close of evidence:

2

JURY'S VERDICT FORM

This document, when completed by you, will constitute the verdict of the jury in this case. This will be the form which you will use to answer the questions discussed with you previously in this charge.

We, the Jury, answer the following questions in the following manner:

INFRINGEMENT

1.   Has Amdocs proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Openet infringes any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,631,065 ("the '065 Patent"), either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents? Please complete the table below with your verdict as to each claim and accused product. 'Yes' indicates that Amdocs has proven Openet's infringement as to that claim and product; 'No' indicates that Amdocs has not proven infringement as to that claim and product.

	Claim 1	Claim 4	Claim 7	Claim 13	Claim 17
Mediation	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Charging	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	N/A	N/A
Network Edge Rating	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	N/A	N/A

1

Balance Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	N/A	N/A
Policy Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	N/A	N/A

2.   Has Amdocs proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Openet

infringes any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,797 ("the '797

Patent"), either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Please complete the

table below with your verdict as to each claim and accused product.   'Yes'

indicates that Amdocs has proven Openet's infringement as to that claim and

product; 'No' indicates that Amdocs has not proven infringement as to that claim

and product.

	Infringes Claim 1	Infringes Claim 2	Infringes Claim 7	Infringes Claim 8	Infringes Claim 19
Mediation	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Charging	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Network Edge Rating	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Balance Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___

Policy Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___

3.   Has Amdocs proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Openet infringes any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 7,412,510 ("the '510 Patent"), either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents? Please complete the table below with your verdict as to each claim and accused product.   'Yes' indicates that Amdocs has proven Openet's infringement as to that claim and product; 'No' indicates that Amdocs has not proven infringement as to that claim and product.

	Infringes Claim 16	Infringes Claim 17	Infringes Claim 19
Mediation	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Charging	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Network Edge Rating	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Balance Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___
Policy Manager	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___

4.   Has Amdocs proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that Openet

infringes any of the asserted claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,947,984 ("the '984

Patent"), either literally or under the Doctrine of Equivalents? Please complete the

table below with your verdict as to each claim and accused product.   'Yes'

indicates that Amdocs has proven Openet's infringement as to that claim and

product; 'No' indicates that Amdocs has not proven infringement as to that claim

and product.

	Infringes Claim 1	Infringes Claim 2	Infringes Claim 6	Infringes Claim 8	Infringes Claim 13
Mediation	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___	Yes ___ No ___

WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT

If you answered 'yes' in any box above, answer this question.

5.   Has Amdocs proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that Openet has

willfully infringed?

       Yes _____   No _____

4

VALIDITY

6.   Has Openet proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the

asserted claims of the '065 Patent is invalid as anticipated by a prior art reference

or invalid as obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention?

	Claim 1	Claim 4	Claim 7	Claim 13	Claim 17
Invalid Because Anticipated	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __
Invalid Because Obvious	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __

7.   Has Openet proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the

asserted claims of the '797 Patent is invalid as anticipated by a prior art reference,

invalid as obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, or

invalid because the '797 Patent lacks adequate written description for that claim?

	Claim 1	Claim 2	Claim 7	Claim 8	Claim 19
Invalid Because Anticipated	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __
Invalid Because Obvious	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __

Invalid Because Lacks Written Description	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __

8. Has Openet proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '510 Patent is invalid as anticipated by a prior art reference to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention?

	Claim 16	Claim 17	Claim 19
Invalid Because Anticipated	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __
Invalid Because Obvious	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __

9. Has Openet proven, by clear and convincing evidence, that any of the asserted claims of the '984 Patent is invalid as anticipated by a prior art reference?

	Claim 1	Claim 2	Claim 6	Claim 8	Claim 13
Invalid Because Anticipated	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __
Invalid Because Obvious	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __	Valid __ Invalid __

DAMAGES

Answer the next question only if at least one claim that you found to be infringed was not proven to be invalid

10.   What amount of damages do you find would fairly and reasonably compensate Amdocs through December 31, 2010?

$_____

The jury foreperson should sign and date the Verdict Form and return it to the Security Officer.

Signed this _____ day of August, 2011.